

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 are pending.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected.

Claim 1 has been amended. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification and drawings, as originally filed.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE

The Examiner stated that the abstract that appears on the cover page of the pamphlet published by the International Bureau (IB) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the abstract that will be used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

The Applicant has no objection to the use of this abstract.

35 USC §102(b) REJECTION

Claims 1, 2 and 5-14 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,634,051 to Thomson.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 USC §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5-14.

The law is clear that anticipation requires that a single prior art reference disclose each and every limitation of the claim sought to be rejected. 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

The law is also clear that a claim in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate all the limitations of the claim to which it refers. 35 U.S.C. §112, fourth paragraph.

In the interests of expediting the prosecution of the instant application, and without admission that any amendment is necessary, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite, among other things, a method utilizing a help software program having a plurality of user databases and a knowledge database, the help program working in conjunction with a computer related application for interacting with a user in a natural language format when the user requires assistance in relation to the computer related application, said method comprising the steps of: (1) identifying the user, (2) obtaining an identification code of the identified user, (3) searching the user databases to link the identification code with one of the user databases, (4) *accessing specific user data from the linked user database that has been generated as a result of at least one previous interaction between the identified user and the help software program and that is specifically related to the identified user*, (5) receiving a user's natural language input, (6) interpreting the natural language input, (7) *formulating a response by integrating the natural language input from the user with specific user data from the linked user database and data from the knowledge database*, (8) submitting the response to the user, and (9) *updating the linked user database with the natural language input and response thereto, whereby future responses to the identified user may refer to the updated linked user database for the identified user*.

Thomson teaches no such methodology.

Specifically, Thomson fails to teach accessing specific user data from a linked user database that has been generated as a result of at least one previous interaction between the identified user and a help software program and that is specifically related to the identified user. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Thomson does not address the issue of accession of any specific user

information, other than ensuring that the identification code that has been entered by the user is valid. However, this information is independent of, and is not based on, any previous interaction between the identified user and the help software program.

Additionally, Thomson fails to teach formulating a response by integrating a natural language input from the user with specific user data from the linked user database and data from the knowledge database. As previously noted, Thomson does not access specific user data regarding past interactions with the help software program from a user database. Thus, it would be impossible to integrate this information with other sources of information to formulate a response, if it is not being collected, accessed and processed in the first place.

Furthermore, Thompson fails to teach updating the linked user database with a natural language input and response thereto, whereby future responses to the identified user may refer to the updated linked user database for the identified user. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Thomson merely updates the index file, as opposed to any linked user database file. There is no discussion of using any of the data generated during the encounter between a user and the help software program for future operational purposes.

Accordingly, Thomson does not anticipate independent claim 1. Additionally, dependent claims 2 and 5-14, which depend from and further limit independent claim 1, are likewise not anticipated by Thomson.

Additionally, Thomson does not render claims 1-2 and 5-14 obvious for at least the reasons set forth above.

35 USC §103(a) REJECTION

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,634,051 to Thomson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,379,366 to Noyes.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 3 and 4.

Neither Thomson and/or Noyes, either alone or in combination therewith, suggests such methodology as recited in claim 1.

As previously noted, Thomson does not anticipate or render obvious independent claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. The Examiner correctly noted that Thomson failed to disclose the step of utilizing a natural language simulator to parse the natural language input before the step of interpreting the natural language.

The recitation of Noyes does not cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Thomson. Specifically, Noyes fails to suggest, among other things, the combination of accessing specific user data from a linked user database that has been generated as a result of at least one previous interaction between the identified user and a help software program and that is specifically related to the identified user, formulating a response by integrating a natural language input from the user with specific user data from the linked user database and data from the knowledge database, and updating the linked user database with a natural language input and response thereto, whereby future responses to the identified user may refer to the updated linked user database for the identified user.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Thomson and/or Noyes, either alone or in combination therewith, for guidance on a method for utilizing a help software program as presently claimed.

Accordingly, neither Thomson and/or Noyes, either alone or in combination therewith, render claim 1 obvious. Additionally, dependent claims 3 and 4, which depend from and further limit independent claim 1, are likewise not rendered obvious by Thomson and/or Noyes, either alone or in combination therewith.

35 USC §103(a) REJECTION

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,634,051 to Thomson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,838,682 to Dekelbaum et al.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 15.

Neither Thomson and/or Dekelbaum et al., either alone or in combination therewith, suggests such methodology as recited in claim 1.

As previously noted, Thomson does not anticipate or render obvious independent claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. The Examiner correctly noted that Thomson failed to disclose the step of determining the need for human intervention and accessing human intervention in a natural language format such that the interaction with the help program and a human representative appears seamless to the user.

The recitation of Dekelbaum et al. does not cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Thomson. Specifically, Dekelbaum et al. fails to suggest, among other things, the combination of accessing specific user data from a linked user database that has been generated as a result of at least one previous interaction between the identified user and a help software program and that is specifically related to the identified user, formulating a response by integrating a natural language

input from the user with specific user data from the linked user database and data from the knowledge database, and updating the linked user database with a natural language input and response thereto, whereby future responses to the identified user may refer to the updated linked user database for the identified user.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Thomson and/or Dekelbaum et al., either alone or in combination therewith, for guidance on a method for utilizing a help software program as presently claimed.

Accordingly, neither Thomson and/or Dekelbaum et al., either alone or in combination therewith, render claim 1 obvious. Additionally, dependent claim 15, which depends from and further limits independent claim 1, is likewise not rendered obvious by Thomson and/or Dekelbaum et al., either alone or in combination therewith.

35 USC §103(a) REJECTION

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,634,051 to Thomson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,455 to Johnson et al.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 16.

Neither Thomson and/or Johnson et al., either alone or in combination therewith, suggests such methodology as recited in claim 1.

As previously noted, Thomson does not anticipate or render obvious independent claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. The Examiner correctly noted that Thomson failed to disclose

the step of formulating a pricing plan for the help program based upon the amount of time the user engaged in conversation with the help program.

The recitation of Johnson et al. does not cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Thomson. Specifically, Johnson et al. fails to suggest, among other things, the combination of accessing specific user data from a linked user database that has been generated as a result of at least one previous interaction between the identified user and a help software program and that is specifically related to the identified user, formulating a response by integrating a natural language input from the user with specific user data from the linked user database and data from the knowledge database, and updating the linked user database with a natural language input and response thereto, whereby future responses to the identified user may refer to the updated linked user database for the identified user.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Thomson and/or Johnson et al., either alone or in combination therewith, for guidance on a method for utilizing a help software program as presently claimed.

Accordingly, neither Thomson and/or Johnson et al., either alone or in combination therewith, render claim 1 obvious. Additionally, dependent claim 16, which depends from and further limits independent claim 1, is likewise not rendered obvious by Thomson and/or Johnson et al., either alone or in combination therewith.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of the Application. The Applicant respectfully submits that each item raised by

Examiner in the Office Action of March 7, 2006 has been successfully traversed, overcome or rendered moot by this response. The Applicant respectfully submits that each of the claims in this Application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicant's undersigned attorney at (248) 723-0487 if any unresolved matters remain.

Any needed extension of time is hereby requested with the filing of this document.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2789.

Respectfully submitted,

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.

June 6, 2006

Date

/Preston H. Smirman/

Preston H. Smirman, Registration No. 35,365

The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite #101

39400 Woodward Ave.

Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-5151

(248) 723-0487